

Serial No. 10/760,454

Docket No. P-0645

Amdt. dated December 22, 2004

Reply to Office Action of September 23, 2004

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 35-53 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 4 are amended, claims 5-34 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, and claims 35-53 are added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Unless otherwise indicated in the remarks set forth below, the amendments to the claims are made for the purpose of correcting informalities and/or to more clearly define the claimed invention, and are not made for the purpose of overcoming the cited art.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0102477A1 to Lee (hereinafter "Lee"). Claims 3, 5-10 and 20 have been canceled, and thus their rejection is now moot. The rejection of claims 1, 2 and 4 is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a front substrate of a plasma display panel including a colorant-added upper dielectric layer, wherein the colorant is Co<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>. Lee fails to teach or suggest this feature. Specifically, Lee discloses a front substrate of a plasma display panel with an upper dielectric layer that includes a colorant that is Nd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> and cobalt oxide, including CoO, Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub>. However, Lee does not teach or suggest at least the recited composition of the upper dielectric layer consisting of Co<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that Lee fails to anticipate the subject matter of claim 1. Claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, and

Serial No. 10/760,454

Docket No. P-0645

Amtd. dated December 22, 2004

Reply to Office Action of September 23, 2004

are thus also allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 11-17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,537 to Onoda et al. Claims 11-17 and 21 have been canceled, and thus this rejection is now moot. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of Onoda et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,714,840 to Tanabe et al. Claim 18 has been canceled, and thus its rejection is now moot. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of Onoda et al., and further in view of Tanabe et al. Claim 19 has been canceled, and thus its rejection is now moot. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,589,894 to Mito et al. Claims 22 and 23 have been canceled, and thus their rejection is now moot. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/760,454

Docket No. P-0645

Amdt. dated December 22, 2004

Reply to Office Action of September 23, 2004

The Office Action rejects claims 24-30, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of Mito et al., and further in view of Onoda et al. Claims 24-30, 33 and 34 have been canceled, and thus their rejection is now moot. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of Onoda et al., and further in view of Tanabe et al. and Mito et al. Claim 31 has been canceled, and thus its rejection is now moot. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Lee in view of Onoda et al., and further in view of Tanabe et al. and Mito et al. Claim 32 has been canceled, and thus its rejection is now moot. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Added claims 35-40 depend from claim 1, and are thus also allowable for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Applicant respectfully submits that added claims 41-53 are allowable over the cited art. For example, with respect to added independent claims 41, 48 and 51, none of the cited art teach or suggest at least the recited glass powder including  $P_2O_5$ - $B_2O_3$ -ZnO group and a colorant. With respect to added independent claim 45, none of the cited art teach or suggest that the recited glass powder is one of  $PbO$ - $B_2O_3$ - $SiO_2$ - $Al_2O_3$ -RO group,  $P_2O_5$ - $B_2O_3$ -ZnO group, ZnO-

Serial No. 10/760,454

Docket No. P-0645

Amdt. dated December 22, 2004

Reply to Office Action of September 23, 2004

B<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-RO group, and PbO-B<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-SiO<sub>2</sub>-Al<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>-BaO group, and a colorant that is at least one of Nd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, CoO, Co<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub> and Co<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Rene A. Vazquez, Esq., at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Rene A. Vazquez  
Registration No. 38,647

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK\RAV:mrh  
**Date: December 22, 2004**

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**